

and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

BOO WHO?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, when Ms. USA recently appeared in Mexico City, she was repeatedly booed every time she was onstage. Apparently, the host and hostess and the "Politically Correct Police" missed it or just ignored it.

The pro-amnesty crowd is moving right along in its efforts to convince the American public that illegal immigration exists because people would do anything to be an American; interesting logic considering recent events. But I've never understood the logic in rewarding 12 to 20 million law breakers with amnesty for any reason.

In America, we seem to do things a little bit different. We cheer for our country. We wave our flag. We invest in our country, and we respect our neighbors. And by respecting neighbors, I don't mean we invade somebody else's country, demand benefits and protest brazenly in the streets waving foreign flags. And where I come from, we never boo a lady.

The booing incident of Americans doesn't come as a big shock to most of us. It has happened before in U.S.-Mexico sporting events. The Mexican team and the Mexican fans booed the U.S. players. It is the disappointment in the lack of reaction from some of our leaders to realize that they are not welcoming future Americans into our country with their amnesty giveaway; they are just giving away the country.

A pathway to citizenship, or earned citizenship, or any other giveaway program they want to call it only works if people really want to become Americans. If you want to be an American, then there are some responsibilities to that. You just don't get to take all you can and leave when you are done.

I don't agree that this amnesty nonsense is what's best for America, and I know, without a doubt, that the uncontrolled border is a natural disaster. Sure, it's great for Mexico. Their struggling economy depends on our citizens; or rather, their citizens' loyalty to their country, not loyalty to our country.

But the argument is that we have to allow those living in our country illegally the opportunity to come out of the shadows and be a part of our country and our culture. That simply is not going to happen, because their loyalty lies with their former nation. And an amnesty giveaway is going to legalize their loyalty to their home country, not make them Americans.

Mexico and other countries promote illegal immigration to the United States with one understanding: You send your money back home to Mexico. And America is not home. Billions

headed south last year to Mexico alone. Remittances from the United States were the second highest revenue for Mexico, right behind the sale of crude oil, beating out tourism.

So when the United States gets booed, people that don't understand this are a bit taken aback. Is it irony or arrogance? Most people don't bite the hands that feed them, especially when you have them eating out of your hand.

The administration recently said, "Those determined to find fault with this bill will always be able to look at a narrow slice of it and find something they don't like. If you want to kill this bill, if you don't want to do what's right for America, you can pick out one little aspect of it."

Although I respect the President greatly, I respectfully suggest he is in error. We cannot accept the narrow slice or the whole amnesty pie. We are not that much of a glutton for this pie in the sky.

Americans deserve better. They deserve real immigration reform that secures the borders with the utmost of urgency and an end to political preference policy for illegals, a policy that discriminates against American citizens and legal immigrants.

We need to end employment opportunities and social benefits intended and entitled to Americans and have legislation that puts the needs and benefits of Americans first.

Kowtowing to Mexico, the country that takes and takes from America but booed Ms. USA off the stage, is exactly what's wrong with this new Senate amnesty bill and this administration's position.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WAITING FOR THE NEXT BIG EVENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last month, despite my objections and many of my colleagues, Congress passed a bill to continue funding the occupation of Iraq. Now everyone is waiting for the next big event in the war, General Petraeus's report on whether the escalation, the surge, is succeeding. This report is due in September.

But with our brave American troops and innocent Iraqis continuing to die, we are remiss if we twiddle our thumbs and wait for September. We need to hold this administration accountable for its actions in Iraq, and we need to do it today, not 3 months from now.

So I want to go back to January 10 of this year, the night that the President announced his new surge policy in a speech to the Nation, to see if he is delivering on what he promised. On that night, he said, "America will hold the Iraqi government to the benchmarks it has announced."

But here we are, Mr. Speaker, 6 months later, and the Iraqi government has made virtually no progress on any of its benchmarks. Even Lieutenant General Douglas Lute, our new war czar, expressed frustration about this in his Senate confirmation hearing. General Lute said, "My assessment would be that the Iraqis have shown very little progress."

Mr. Speaker, back on January 10, we were told that the surge would help the Iraqis carry out their campaign to put down sectarian violence. But the Pentagon's own report on the current situation, which was released last Wednesday, said that the violence continues to be driven by sectarianism. In other words, we've sent our troops to fight a civil war that has nothing to do with protecting America from terrorism.

Also, back on January 10, the escalation speech included these words: "Our military forces in Anbar are killing and capturing al Qaeda leaders."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, in the Senate hearing I mentioned a moment ago, Senator EVAN BAYH quoted a top CIA expert in saying that the American presence in Iraq is creating more members of al Qaeda than we are killing.

The President claims that he has the power to grab people off the streets of America, declare them enemy combatants and order the military to hold them indefinitely. But last week, a Federal Appeals Court ruled that, "to sanction such authority would have disastrous consequences for the Constitution and for the country."

The President says that he is a strict constructionist when it comes to the Constitution. But he has shown that he is not a strict constructionist, not a loose constructionist, but a non constructionist who simply ignores the Constitution.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for a new policy in Iraq. We must fully fund the safe redeployment of our troops. We must guarantee the very best health care for our veterans. We must work with the Iraqi people and the international community to provide for the reconstruction of Iraq. We must look to diplomacy, not preemptive war, to help Iraq and its neighbors to achieve political solutions to the region's problems, and there must be no permanent American military bases in Iraq.

And America must rely, once again, on our most powerful weapons in the fight against terrorism, our Constitution and our democratic values.

And, Mr. Speaker, we must bring our troops home.